

essity whenever there is a departure from any well defined principle, tenet, or Bible doctrine.

Cave, in his *Historia Literaria* Vol. 1, page 223, gives the following account of their faith: "There is one God, uncreated and without beginning; who has nothing existing before him, for nothing can exist before what is uncreated; nor with him for what is uncreated must be one; nor in him, for God is a simple and uncompounded being. This one simple and eternal being is God, the creator and ordainer of all things; first, indeed, and principally of his only begotten Son; and then through him of all other things. For God begat, created, and made the Son only by his direct operation and powers before all things, and every other creature; not producing, however, any being like himself, or imparting any of his own proper substance to the Son; God is immortal, uniform, indivisible; and therefore cannot communicate any part of his own proper substance to another. He alone is begotten; and it is impossible that any other being should be formed of an unbegotten substance. He did not use his own substance in begetting the Son, but his will only; nor did he beget him in the likeness of his substance, but according to his own good pleasure. He then created the Holy Spirit, the first and greatest of all spirits, by his own power, indeed and operation mediately; yet by the immediate power and operation of the Son. After the Holy Spirit, he created all other things in heaven and earth, visible and invisible, corporeal and incorporeal, mediately by himself, by the power and operation of the Son, etc." The reader will evidently see how near these tenets are to those of Arianism, well authenticated history teaches us that the Eunomians practiced single action dipping, they having been a branch of the Arians, and their views concerning the God-head etc., being so near identical as already expressed. I have no doubt but that the Arians were the first to institute and practice single action baptism in the third century, prior to that time the general practice was trine dipping, which can be fully established by well authenticated history. Rev. William Cathcart D. D., a single action dipper, a Baptist in his work entitled the "Baptism of the Ages and of the Nations," says that "Trine immersion was the general practice of Christians from the end of the second till the close of the twelfth century. The proof of this statement is overwhelming." About A. D. 370, another sect arose, calling themselves Agnotal (from agnoso, to be ignorant of.) They called in question the omniscience of God; alleging that he knew

things past only by memory, and things future only by an uncertain prescience.

This sect was evidently well named. The Gnostics knew too much and the Agnostics knew too little. If both had taken the Bible alone, they would not have been either Gnostic nor Agnostic, but of the "church" of God. There arose another sect of the same name in the sixth century, who followed Themistius, deacon of Alexandria. They maintained that Christ was ignorant of certain things, and particularly of the time of the day of Judgment. The Adamites, a sect that sprung up in the second century. Epiphanius tells us that they were called Adamites from their pretending to be re-established in the state of innocence, such as Adam was, at the moment of his creation, whence they ought to imitate him in going naked. They detested marriage, maintaining that the conjugal union would never have taken place upon earth, had sin been unknown. It is said that they would assemble at night, and that one of the fundamental maxims of their society was contained in the following verse:

Jura, Perjura, Secretum Procere noli.
Swear forswear, and reveal not the secret.

The Immanuel God man, the anointed Savior only originated, built and established one religious institution that called that institution "church," without any handle or qualifying term in contra-distinction of any other system of religion taught or instituted by God the Father, God the Son, or God the Holy Spirit. And further, the Triune God never authorized any council Ecumenical or Ecclesiastical, to originate, institute and establish any system of religion or worship different from that established through and by him that said, "upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell (or death) shall not prevail against it."

A CORRECTION.

D. C. MOOMAW.

The statement is being extensively circulated among our people that I am contemplating returning to the G. B. fold. It doubtless has its foundation from an interview I had recently with a prominent G. B. elder from the West on the subject of a union of the G. B. and Brethren organizations. It was advocated, in that interview, that the causes that led to the organization of the Brethren church have practically disappeared from the polity of the G. B. organization and that an effort should be made, in the interests of the Master's kingdom, to unite the separated brethren. To the student of our current history these facts are patent and it is clear to a lover of purity and peace that

such an effort should be made, and if made, with only the glory of God in aim, that it will succeed.

I wish to say here and now that I *have not a scintilla of inclination to take independent action in the matter.* Our church home and privileges are *entirely satisfactory*, and adequate to all the demands of our spiritual nature, and the sweets of Christian fellowship cannot be excelled in any association. If there should be a union of the two organizations it will be on the basis of the *Gospel-alone as our only rule of faith and practice*, which happily, both organizations advocate, and under the new administration the tragedies of Berlin, Bridgewater, Lanark and others equally noted, will be impossible of repetition.

The G. B. brethren are willing to confess that Progression, as it crystalized into an organization in 1882 is right and they have fully adopted, in practice, its polity and now they graciously suggest the inauguration of a movement for a reunion, and we should meet them as graciously.

We wish to say, however, that the churches of the two organizations may not be fully ripe for the movement and, in the meantime, let every minister of the Brethren church push his work with renewed and redoubled vigor. I am assured that the people were never more anxious for the preaching of *our* doctrine than they are now and that, at no period of our history, has there been more vitality displayed in every department of church work. While negotiations are pending looking to a union let no soldier rest on his shield or retire to his tent. It may be five or ten years before a union can be effected and it may never come. We will lose nothing by the effort. If it does nothing more than to clearly and officially define the points of divergence between us it will be favorable to us.

We confess that when we see the radical decisions adopted at their district and annual Conferences, looking to the unrooting of the "order" into the heart of their church polity the prospects of a union are not brilliant, but a decade has scarcely elapsed since their antagonism against Sunday-schools, high schools, missionary enterprises, etc., was as pronounced as their devotions to the "order" is to-day. We notice especially that expulsion for violation of the "order" is *practically obsolete* and that the mission of the once arrogant A. M. committee is not what it was before the eighties.

The prize of union is worth working and praying for and let us give success in years to its accomplishment.